[ERA Docket No. 80-CERT-025]

Gulf States Utilities Co.; Application for Certification of the Use of Natural Gas to Displace Fuel Oil

Gulf States Utilities Company (Gulf States), 285 Liberty Street, P.O. Box 2951, Beaumont, Texas 77704, filed on July 2, 1980 an application for certification of an eligible use of natural gas to displace fuel oil at its Roy S. Nelson Generating Station in Westlake, Louisiana, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 595 (44 FR 47920, August 16, 1979). More detailed information is contained in the application on file with the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) and available for public inspection at the ERA, Docket Room 7108, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20461, from 8:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Delay in the issuance of this notice was caused by the applicant's request that his application be held in abeyance due to the possibility of changes in it.

In its application, Gulf States indicates that the volume of natural gas for which it requests certification is up to 100,000 Mcf per day. This volume is estimated to displace the use of approximately 16,129 barrels of No. 6 residual fuel oil (0.7 percent maximum sulfur) per day.

The eligible seller is the Koch Hydrocarbon Company, 1000 Capital National Bank Building, Houston, Texas 77002. The gas will be transported by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77002.

In order to provide the public with as much opportunity to participate in this proceeding as is practicable under the circumstances, we are inviting any person wishing to comment concerning this application to submit comments in writing to the Economic Regulatory Administration, Room 7108, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20461, Attention: Mr. Albert F. Bass, on or before September 15, 1980.

An opportunity to make an oral presentation of data, views, and arguments either against or in support of this application may be requested by any interested person in writing on or before September 15, 1980. The request should state the person's interest, and, if appropriate, why the person is a proper representative of a group or class of persons that has such an interest. The request should include a summary of the proposed oral presentation and a statement as to why an oral presentation is necessary. If ERA determines that an oral presentation is necessary, further notice will be given to Gulf States and any persons filing comments and will be published in the Federal Register.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1980.

F. Scott Bush,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Regulatory Policy, Economic Regulatory Administration.

[FR Doc. 80-27251 Filed 9-4-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 1579-7]

Public Hearing: Adequacy of Attention to Conservation and the Environment by the Department of Energy

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces a Public Hearing on the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Conservation and Solar Energy Program. The Hearings will be held at the Office of Personnel Management's Auditorium, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., on September 24 and 25, 1980. The public is invited.

A pre-hearing document is also available for public review and comment. Requests for copies of this document and for more information on the Hearing should be addressed to the Environmental Protection Agency at the address below.

Section 11 of the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93–577) directs the responsible agency (formerly the Council on Environmental Quality, now EPA) to carry out a continuing analysis of the Federal nonnuclear energy research and development program. The analysis assesses the "adequacy of attention" to energy conservation methods and environmental protection, as well as to the environmental consequences of the application of nonnuclear technologies.

The 1980 hearings will focus on the adequacy of attention to energy conservation and solar energy within the Department of Energy. Aspects of the review include:

(1) *Policy.* Have the potential contributions of conservation and solar programs been considered adequately by the Department in formulating its energy policies and in planning its programs?

(2) *Programs.* Has adequate attention been given to the implementation of DOE Conservation and Solar programs at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure their maximum effectiveness?

(3) *Evaluation.* Has the Department equipped itself well to allocate resources wisely and to maintain quality control over the management of its programs, by providing adequately for the evaluation of the effectiveness of its programs?

Under the direction of the Act, annual public hearings are held to provide the opportunity for interested individuals or groups to testify. The September Public Hearing has been preceded by a series of Section 11 regional workshops held during June and July in Raleigh-Durham, NC; San Francisco, CA; St. Paul-Minneapolis, MN; Denver, CO; and Portland, OR. The workshops dealt with Federal conservation and solar energy policy analysis; program evaluation; research, development, and applications; and State and local assistance programs. A half day session during the two day hearing will be focused on each of these four topics.

A Report to the President and Congress, to be available in January 1981, will summarize the 1980 Section 11 program. Specific findings and recommendations will be made relative to EPA's review of DOE's conservation and solar energy program.

Further information about this Hearing and the pre-hearing document, which will summarize the regional workshops and outline the issues for discussion at the Hearing, may be obtained by contacting Gregory Ondich (202) 426–9434.

Individuals or organizations wishing to testify at the Hearing should submit, by September 15, 1980, a brief summary of their intended testimony to: Section 11 Coordinator (RD–681), Office of Environmental Engineering and Technology, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Witnesses may submit written testimony and/or deliver an oral statement of up to ten (10) minutes in length. Additional time will be available for questions and comments from a panel of experts. An open period will be provided each day for unscheduled public testimony or questions. Transcripts of the September Hearing will be available to the public.

Dated: August 15, 1980.

Kurt Riegel,

Associate Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Environmental Engineering and Technology.

[FR Doc. 80-25415 Filed 9-5-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[FRL 1595-2]

Approval of Proprietary Fuel Additive

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of grant of a fuel additive waiver application.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 211(f)(4) of the Clean Air Act (Act), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7454(f)(4)(1977), the Administrator of EPA hereby grants the waiver requested by Texaco, Inc. (Texaco) for a proprietary non-metallic nitrogenous fuel additive, designated as TC–11064, which provides detergent and anti-corrosion performance, to be used at a maximum concentration of 60 pounds per thousand barrels (PTB) of unleaded gasoline (1 barrel equals 42 gallons). This waiver is granted based on the Administrator's determination that the information that Texaco submitted was sufficient to establish that this proprietary additive will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such device or system is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act.

PUBLIC DOCKET: Copies of information on this waiver application are available for inspection in public docket EN–80–12 at the Central Docket Section (A–130) of the Environmental Protection Agency, Gallery I—West Tower, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. As provided in 40 CFR Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged for copying services.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James J. Kohanek, Attorney-Advisor, Field Operations and Support Division (EN–397), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 472–9367.

Decision of the Administrator

I. Introduction

Section 211(f)(1) of the Act makes it unlawful, effective March 31, 1977, for any fuel or fuel additive manufacturer to first introduce into commerce or increase the concentration in use of any fuel or fuel additive for use in light duty motor vehicles manufactured after model year 1974 which is not substantially similar to any fuel or fuel additive utilized in the certification of any model year 1975, or subsequent model year, vehicle or engine under section 206 of the Act. Section 211(f)(4) of the Act provides that the Administrator of EPA may waive the prohibitions of section 211(f)(1) upon application of any fuel or fuel additive manufacturer if the Administrator determines that the applicant has established that such fuel or fuel additive will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such device or system is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act. If the Administrator does not act to grant or deny an application within 180 days of its receipt, the waiver shall be treated as granted.

Texaco filed an application on March 5, 1980, for a waiver for a fuel additive designated as TC–11064 but stated that the chemical composition of the fuel additive (hereafter proprietary additive) is confidential. The 180-day review period terminates September 1, 1980. A Federal Register notice was published on June 9, 1980 (45 FR 38440), acknowledging receipt of Texaco's application. The notice also solicited comments and data from other interested parties on Texaco's proprietary additive.[1] Texaco concluded from the data it submitted that unleaded gasoline containing this proprietary additive, at the maximum concentration specified, (60 PTB of unleaded gasoline), and its emission products do not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such device or system is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act.

II. Summary of the Decision

I have determined that Texaco has met the burden under section 211(f)(4) necessary to obtain a waiver for the proprietary additive as long as the concentration of the proprietary additive does not exceed 60 PTB of unleaded gasoline.

In determining whether an applicant has established the necessary burden, the Administrator may look at all of the available information and data including that provided by persons other than the applicant. The data submitted in this matter was solely by Texaco. I find that the foregoing information is sufficient to establish that the proprietary additive and its emission products will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such device or system is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act.

I hereby grant the waiver to Texaco for its proprietary additive provided the proprietary additive is used at a concentration which does not exceed 60 PTB of unleaded gasoline.

III. Method of Review

In order to obtain a waiver for a fuel or fuel additive (hereinafter, "fuel or fuel additive" will be collectively referred to as "additive") the applicant must establish that the additive and its emission products will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such system or device is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act. This burden, which Congress has imposed on the applicant, if interpreted literally, is virtually impossible to meet as it requires the proof of a negative proposition, i.e., that no vehicle will fail to meet emission standards with respect to which it has been certified. Taken literally, it would require the testing of every vehicle. Recognizing that Congress contemplated a workable waiver provision, some mitigation of this stringent burden was deemed necessary. For purposes of the waiver provision, EPA has previously indicated that reliable statistical sampling and fleet testing protocols may be used to demonstrate that an additive under consideration would not cause or contribute to failure of emissions standards by vehicles in the national fleet (see, Waiver Decision on Tertiary Butyl Alcohol (TBA), 44 FR 10530 (1979)).

Emissions data submitted in support of a waiver request are analyzed by appropriate statistical methods in order to characterize the effect that an additive will have on emissions.[2] The statistical tests applied to the emission data provided in support of a waiver request for an additive which is expected to have an instantaneous

[1] The information relevant to this decision which is proprietary involves the chemical composition of the fuel additive. Texaco made the proprietary additive available to qualified and interested parties for testing purposes provided that such party would execute a confidentiality agreement with Texaco.

[2] The tests which are appropriate to characterize the emission effects of an additive depend on whether the additive is expected to have an instantaneous effect or a long-term deteriorative effect on emissions, or both. If a long-term deteriorative effect is expected, then 50,000 mile durability testing and materials compatibility testing would be necessary. The results would be analyzed using the tests used in the MMT decision (see 43 FR 41424 (1978)). For the reasons set out under section IV(C)(1), *infra*, EPA believes that the proprietary additive at issue in this decision would probably have an instantaneous effect. Thus, the method of review set out in the decision, which is designed to test instantaneous effects, would apply.

emissions effect are: Paired Difference Test, Sign of Difference Test, and Deteriorated Emissions Test (a test which compares the deteriorated emissions with the emission standards).[3] These statistical tests are described in Appendix 1 to this decision.

An alternative to providing sufficient data necessary to enable conclusive statistical results to be performed is to make judgments based upon a reasonable theory regarding emission effects. These judgments should be supported with confirmatory testing. If there exists a reasonable theory which predicts the emission effects of an additive, an applicant may only need to conduct a sufficient amount of testing to demonstrate the validity of such theory. This theory along with confirmatory testing then form the basis from which the Administrator may exercise his judgment on whether the additive will cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system to achieve compliance by the vehicle with emission standards. In addition to emissions data, EPA also reviews data on materials compatibility, driveability, fuel composition and specifications. This information is necessary to fully characterize an additive, and to determine whether such additive will cause or contribute to a failure of vehicles to comply with appropriate emission standards. Such failure could result if driveability is impaired. Driveability problems such as lean misfire and repeated starting lead to increased emissions. Materials compatibility problems could lead to failure of fuel systems which are designed to precise tolerances. Deviations beyond these tolerances could result in greater emissions. Volatility specifications could demonstrate a tendency for high evaporative losses.

IV. Analysis

A. Exhaust Emission Data

Exhaust emission data were submitted on fifteen vehicles tested on a base fuel and a base fuel containing 60 PTB of the proprietary additive (hereinafter referred to as "waiver fuel").[4] Summarized in Appendix 2 are the numerical results of the three statistical tests. Tests 1 and 2 are designed to determine whether the proprietary additive contributes to a failure of vehicles to meet emission standards. Test 3 is designed to determine if the proprietary additive will cause the failure of vehicles to meet emission standards.

With regard to the application of the Paired Difference Test (Test 1), the hydrocarbons (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions decreased and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions were not adversely affected. To be able to utilize the Paired Difference Test to arrive at a conclusion, for each pollutant, the upper bound of the confidence interval must be equal to or less than ten percent of the applicable standard, e.g., with a HC standard of 1.5 grams per mile, the upper bound of the interval must be 0.15 or less, when the interval contains zero. In this instance, the intervals for HC and CO pollutants were below zero while the NOx interval contained zero but maintained an upper bound within 10% of the applicable standard.

The results of test 2 indicate a low confidence level that CO and HC emissions will increase. A somewhat higher confidence (84.9%) of an increase in NO_x was observed. This level is still below the 90% confidence level at which we would conclude that NO_x emissions increase.

The results of the third test indicate that the proprietary additive containing fuel satisfied the criterion for this sample, and would not cause vehicles to exceed emission standards when emissions deterioration for 50,000 miles was included in the analysis.

Because tests 1 and 2 for the proprietary additive containing fuel show no adverse on emissions as a group, and the analysis under test 3 shows that emission standards were not exceeded, I conclude that the proprietary additive does not cause or contribute to the failure of vehicles to meet exhaust emission standards.

B. Materials Compatibility

Texaco addressed the issue of materials compatibility by conducting tests on metallic and non-metallic components of various test vehicles.

The non-metallic fuel system test parts were obtained from the 1979 automobiles with oxidation catalysts, and included parts from the fuel pump, and carburetor as well as the fuel line filter and hose. The parts were soaked for four weeks under ambient conditions in the base fuel and fuel containing 60 PTB of the proprietary additive. The results indicate satisfactory compatibility since no visible differences were observed between those parts exposed to the base fuel and those parts exposed to the fuel containing the proprietary additive.[5]

The effect of the proprietary additive on steel was evaluated under the National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE) Test. Corrosion tests on carburetor metal was performed utilizing a fuel/distilled water mixture soak for two weeks at ambient temperature. Brass, copper and solder strips were stored in a fuel/distilled water mixture for one week at 120° F, while aluminum and magnesium strips were stored in the mixture at ambient temperature for two weeks. The data indicate satisfactory results under the particular conditions for all metallic parts tested.[6]

C. Technical Issues

The varying nature of fuels and fuel additives may alter the type of testing required to determine whether such fuels or fuel additives cause or contribute to the failure of vehicles to comply with emission standards. The following examination reviews the available data and determinations which can be made as to proprietary additive in regard to the testing of durability, evaporative emissions and driveability.

1. *Durability.* A fuel or fuel additive which is expected to affect the performance of emission control devices or systems adversely over a period of time and mileage may require 50,000 mile durability testing to determine whether such effects exist. On the other hand, a fuel or fuel additive which is expected to have only an instantaneous emission effect on a vehicle could be judged by comparing back-to-back emission tests on the same vehicle.[7] It is possible that a fuel or fuel additive may operate to cause both an instantaneous increase and an increased deterioration of emission control systems or devices. If so, then both durability emissions data and instantaneous emissions data may be required.

Upon examination of the available data on materials compatibility and the chemistry of the fuel additive, EPA has concluded that 50,000 mile durability testing data are not essential to this waiver decision. The purpose of the detergent proprietary additive is to provide deposit control and anti-corrosion performance. The physical

[3] These tests may only be performed when sufficient data are available.

[4] The vehicles are fully described in Table 1 of the Characterization Report. (See, Characterization Report, Analysis of Data to Characterize the Impact of TC-11064 on Tailpipe and Evaporative Emissions, document number II-A, Public Docket EN 80-12 (hereinafter referred to as "Characterization Report")). Also, the physical and chemical properties of the respective fuels are presented in Tables 2 and 3 of the Characterization Report.

[5] See Table 8 in the Characterization Report.

[6] See Table 9 in the Characterization Report.

[7] Back-to-back testing involves measuring sequentially, the emissions from a particular vehicle, first operated on a base fuel not containing the waiver request fuel additive and then on the base fuel containing the additive.

properties for the non-metallic proprietary additive indicate that formation of deposits as a reactant product is minimal since the percent ash is less than 0.001%.[8]

An examination of the available materials compatibility information and the low concentrations of the proprietary additive in the unleaded fuel (240 parts per million (ppm)) allows me to determine that the emissions effect, if any, of this fuel additive would be of the instantaneous and not of a deteriorative nature.[9] A reasonable estimate of a test vehicle's emission performance on this fuel additive can be obtained using back-to-back emission test data in lieu of requiring 50,000 mile durability testing.

2. *Evaporative Emissions.* The proprietary additive is sufficiently high in molecular weight relative to commercial gasoline to possess a low vapor pressure, and at the low concentration utilized, should have a negligible effect on evaporative emissions. This is verified by comparing the Reid vapor pressures (RVP) of the base fuel and fuel with the proprietary additive.[10] Also, the distillation properties of the waiver fuel are within the ASTM specifications [11] and are similar to the base fuel.[12]

3. *Driveability.* Poor driveability caused by a fuel or fuel additive could impact emissions either through engine malfunction or misadjustment of engine components in an effort to improve driveability. An appreciable increase in the volume of oxygen from an additive could affect the fuel to air ratio and result in lean misfire. As noted, the concentration of the proprietary additive is very small and the oxygen contributed by it in combustion will be minimal compared to the volume of exygen already present during combustion in unleaded gasoline. The fuel to air ratio should not be affected by the low volume of oxygen. It is therefore concluded that driveability is not a significant problem provided resulting fuel is manufactured according to accepted industry practices.

V. Findings and Conclusions

I have determined that Texaco has established that its proprietary additive will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system (over the useful life of any vehicle in which such device or system is used) to achieve compliance by the vehicle with the emission standards with respect to which it has been certified pursuant to section 206 of the Act.

I hereby grant the waiver to Texaco for its proprietary additive provided the proprietary additive is used at a concentration which does not exceed 60 pounds per thousand barrels (PTB) of unleaded gasoline.

This is a final Agency action. Jurisdiction to review this action lies exclusively in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, judicial review of this action is available *only* by the filing of a petition for review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit within 60 days of September 5, 1980. Under section 307(b)(2) today's action may not be challenged later in a separate judicial proceeding brought by the Agency to enforce a statutory or regulatory requirements.

Dated: August 29, 1980.

Barbara Blum,

Acting Administrator.

Appendix 1—Statistical Criteria

The following is a brief description of the statistical tests used to characterize the emission effects of an additive:

(1) *The Paired Difference Test*

For each vehicle tested on a base fuel and on the waiver fuel or fuel additive, the difference between the waiver fuel or fuel additive emissions and the base fuel emissions is calculated. A 90% confidence interval is constructed for the mean differences. If the resulting interval lies entirely below zero it is indicative of no adverse effect from this waiver fuel or fuel additive. If the entire interval is above zero, it is indicative of an adverse effect from the waiver fuel or fuel additive. If the interval contains zero, there is arguably no difference between the base fuel and the waiver fuel or fuel additive with regard to emissions provided the confidence interval is small.

(2) *The Sign of Difference Test*

For each vehicle tested with a base fuel and the waiver fuel or fuel additive, the sign of the emission difference between the waiver fuel or fuel additive emissions and a base fuel emissions is ascertained. This test is designed to determine whether the number of vehicles demonstrating and increase (+) in emissions with the waiver fuel or fuel additive significantly (at a 90% confidence level) exceeded those showing a decrease (−) in emissions with the waiver fuel or fuel additive.

(3) *The Deteriorated Emissions Test*

For each vehicle, the effect the waiver fuel or fuel additive had on emissions is determined. Any change in emissions, either positive or negative, attributable to the waiver fuel or fuel additive is added to the 50,000 mile certification emission value of the certification emission vehicle which the test vehicle represented. This incremented 50,000 mile emission value is compared to emission standards to determine if it did or did not exceed the standards. Either a pass or fail is assigned accordingly. The pass/fail results are analyzed using a one-sided sign test.

The Paired Difference Test and the Sign of Difference Test are designed to determine whether the waiver fuel or fuel additive has an adverse effect on emissions as compared to the base fuel. Each characterizes a different aspect of adverse effect. The Paired Difference Test determines the mean difference in emissions between the base fuel and the waiver fuel or fuel additive. The Sign of Difference Test assesses the number of vehicles indicating an increase or decrease in emissions. The two tests are considered together in evaluating whether an adverse effect exists to assure that a mean difference determination is not unduly influenced by very high or very low emission results from only a few vehicles.

The Deteriorated Emissions Test analysis indicates whether the waiver fuel or fuel additive causes a vehicle to fail to meet emission standards. This test examines each vehicle's emission performance as compared to each pollutant standard.

It is useful to perform this analysis even if the first two analyses indicate the waiver fuel or fuel additive has no adverse effect. The analysis indicates whether the emissions from any particular type of vehicles or special emission control technologies are uniquely sensitive to the waiver fuel or fuel additive, thus causing vehicles to fail to meet emission standards. This effect could be masked in the previous analyses which consider the emissions results as a group without distinguishing the emissions impact on subgroups.

Appendix 2—Numerical Summary of the Statistical Tests

1. *Paired Difference Test*

Listed below are the 90% confidence intervals around the mean difference between the base fuel and the waiver fuel emission level.

a. Hydrocarbons (HC) −0.102 to −0.014.
b. Carbon Monoxide (CO) −1.81 to −0.22.

[8] See Table 4 in the Characterization Report.
[9] See Tables 8 and 9 in the Characterization Report.
[10] See Tables 2 and 3 in the Characterization Report.
[11] Annual Book of ASTM Standards, ASTM D-86.
[12] Two different batches of the base fuel were used as indicated by Tables 2 and 3 in the Characterization Report since the two types of catalysts were tested at differing times.

c. Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) —0.065 to 0.095.

2. *Sign of Difference Test*

Set out below is the percent confidence with which one could state that the proprietary additive will cause an increase in the emissions over the base fule emissions based on the observed increases in emissions out of the total vehicles tested (in parentheses are the number of observed increases out of the total sample size).[13]

a. HC (7/15) 0.4% confidence of an increase.
b. CO (5/15) 5.9% confidence of an increase.
c. NOx (13/15) 84.9% confidence of an increase.

3. *Deteriorated Emissions Test*

Listed below are the number of vehicles whose incremental 50,000 mile emission values exceed emission standards.[14]

a. HC—None out of fourteen.
b. CO—None out of fourteen.
c. NOx—One out of fourteen.

[FR Doc. 80-27179 Filed 9-4-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[FRL 1600-5]

Availability of Environmental Impact Statements

AGENCY: Office of Environmental Review (A-104), U.S. Environmental Protection agency.

PURPOSE: This Notice Lists the Environmental Impact Statements (EISS) which have been officially filed with the EPA and distributed to Federal agencies and interested groups, organizations and individuals for review pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations (40 CFR part 1506.9).

PERIOD COVERED: This notice includes EIS's filed during the week of August 25, 1980 to August 29, 1980.

REVIEW PERIODS: The 45-day Review Period for Draft EIS's listed in this notice is calculated from September 5, 1980 and will end on October 20, 1980. The 30-day review period for final EIS's as calculated from September 5, 1980 will end on October 6, 1980.

EIS AVAILABILITY: To obtain a copy of an EIS listed in this notice you should contact the Federal agency which prepared the EIS. This notice will give a contact person for each Federal agency which has filed an EIS during the period covered by the notice. If a Federal agency does not have the EIS available upon request you may contact the Office of Environmental Review, EPA, for further information.

BACK COPIES OF EIS'S: Copies of EIS's previously filed with EPA or CEQ which are no longer available from the originating agency are available with charge from the following sources:

For public availability and/or hard copy reproduction of EIS's filed prior to March 1980: Environmental Law Institute, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

For hard copy reproduction or microfiche: Information Resources Press, 1700 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 (703) 558-8270.

For further information contact: Kathi L. Wilson, Office of Environmental Review (A-104), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, (202) 245-3006.

SUMMARY OF NOTICE: On July 30, 1979, the CEQ regulations became effective. Pursuant to section 1506.10(a), the 30-day review period for final EIS's received during a given week will now be calculated from Friday of the following week. Therefore, for all final EIS's received during the week of August 25, 1980 to August 29, 1980 the 30-day review period will be calculated from September 5, 1980. The review period will end on October 6, 1980.

Appendix I sets forth a list of EIS's filed with EPA during the week of August 25, 1980 to August 29, 1980. The Federal agency filing the EIS, the name, address, and telephone number of the Federal agency contact for copies of the EIS, the filing status of the EIS, the actual date the EIS was filed with EPA, the title of the EIS, the State(s) and county(ies) of the proposed action and a brief summary of the proposed Federal action and the Federal agency EIS number, if available, is listed in this notice. Commenting entities on draft EIS's are listed for final EIS's.

Appendix II sets forth the EIS's which agencies have granted an extended review period or EPA has approved a waiver from the prescribed review period. The appendix II includes the Federal agency responsible for the EIS, the name, address, and telephone number of the Federal agency contact, the title, State(s) and county(ies) of the EIS, the date EPA announced availability of the EIS in the Federal Register and the newly established date for comments.

Appendix III sets forth a list of EIS's which have been withdrawn by a Federal agency.

Appendix IV sets forth a list of EIS retractions concerning previous notices of availability which have been made because of procedural noncompliance with NEPA or the CEQ regulations by the originating Federal agency.

Appendix V sets forth a list of reports or additional supplemental information relating to previously filed EIS's which have been made available to EPA by Federal agencies.

Appendix VI sets forth official corrections which have been called to EPS's attention.

Dated: September 3, 1980.

William N. Hedeman, Jr.,

Director, Office of Environmental Review (A-104).

Appendix I

EIS's Filed With EPA During the Week of August 25 Through 29, 1980

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Mr. Barry Flamm, Director, Office of Environmental Quality, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 412-A, Admin. Building, Washington, D.C. 20250 (202) 447-3965.

Forest Service

DRAFT

Alaska National Lands Withdrawal Request, Alaska, August 28: This EIS describes the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture through the Secretary of the Interior for a proposed withdrawal under section 204(c) of Pub. L. 94-579 Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 for national forest lands in Alaska. It describes a range of three alternatives with various time options considered in identifying the action. The anticipated effects to the region's present programs and the 12 points of analysis as required by section 204(c) are presented. The rationale for the proposed action is described. (EIS Order No. 800642).

The review period for the above EIS will end on October 6, 1980. (See appendix II)

Verde Wild and Scenic River Study, Yavapai and Gila Counties, Ariz., August 28: Proposed is the inclusion of a segment of the Verde River, Yavapai and Gila Counties, Arizona, in the wild and scenic rivers system. The portion of the river to be studied is 78 miles long within the Coconino, Prescott and Tonto National Forests, of which 72.5 is recommended for designation. Of the 72.5 miles of river affected, 33 miles meet the criteria for a recreational river, 22 miles meet scenic river criteria, and the remaining 17.5 miles are suited for a wild river classification. In addition to no action, the alternatives consider designation of certain sections of the river, and designation of all 78 miles. (EIS Order No. 800635).

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Final

Bear Creek, Wilson Bend and Hamilton areas, lease, several counties in Alabama, August 29: Proposed is the issuance of

---

[13] For this test, an increase in emissions exists when the emission level for the waiver fuel is greater than the emission level for the base fuel and is assigned a (+). Similarly, a lower emissions level for the waiver fuel than the base fuel is a decrease in emissions and is assigned a (−).

[14] The vehicle identification information was not available for one of the vehicles tested and was therefore excluded from this procedure.